

November 20, 2007

Dear Examiner Senfi:

; _. _. ,.. vā

This communication is attached to the accompanying Request for Continuation and is in regard to patent application serial no. 10/006,444 entitled "Optimizations for Live Event, Real-time, 3D Object Tracking." Please find enclosed my check number 1110 covering the \$405 RCE fee for small entities.

In response to your recent ruling that the pending application must be refilled as an RCE in order for the submitted revised claims to be further considered, please cancel Claims 125 - 156 and add new Claims 157 - 176. Please note that new Claims 157 - 176 are exactly equivalent to cancelled Claims 125 - 134 and 141 - 150. Also of note is that now cancelled Claims 135 - 140 and 151 - 156, that were objected to for nostatutory obviousness type double-patenting are being submitted as new claims in a related divisional application of the present pending application, along with the required terminal disclaimer.

Also, regarding the present specification, please replace the Related Art section, found at the top of page 1, to now read:

Related Applications

The present invention is a continuation in part of U.S. patent application serial number 09/510,922 filed on February 22, 2000, now issued U.S. Patent 6,707,487 B1, as well as U.S. patent application serial number 09/197,219 filed on November 20, 1998, now issued U.S. Patent 6,567,116.

The following applicant arguments are repeated verbatim from the response filed October 15, 2007:

With respect to my Office visit on October 2nd, and further with respect to the referenced art of Sengupta, the present inventor respectfully submits that the new independent system claim 157 and matching method claim 167, clearly state a "automatic two-stage" system that is not found in any of the referenced art. The first stage is made up entirely of fixed cameras with a mandatory combined view covering the entire tracking area. This stage is exclusively and solely responsible for tracking all objects within the entire area at all times, only in two-dimensions and does not rely on any information from the second stage. All first cameras in this first stage work together in parallel, and not in the series or "hand-off" approach preferred by Sengupta.

The second stage of claims 157 and 167 is made up entirely of moving cameras that are controlled by the object tracking information determined from the first stage. There video information is not required or used to update the tracking locations of any objects within the tracking area, which is not the case with Sengupta.